

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8, 18 and 23 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. No new matter is added. Claims 21 and 22 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited in those claims. A Request for Continued Examination is attached. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 8, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,966,193 to Zhang et al. (hereinafter "Zhang") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,912,020 to Kawata; claims 5-7, 18 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of Kawata and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,885,417 to Murade and U.S. Patent 6,781,651 to Song et al. (hereinafter "Song"); and claims 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of Kawata, Murade and Song, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,429,962 to Yang and U.S. Patent No. 5,546,204 to Ellis. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, a first storage capacitor electrode electrically connected to the thin film transistor and the pixel electrode; a second storage capacitor electrode electrically connected to the shielding layer and overlapping the first storage capacitor in plan view, the second storage capacitor electrode being electrically isolated from the data line and being formed in the same layer and from the same material as the data line; a first titanium nitride film being included in the shielding layer and being formed along the data line and wider than the data line; and a second titanium nitride film included in the data line and the second storage capacitor electrode.

None of the applied prior art references teaches, nor in any combination can they reasonably be considered to have suggested, at least the features of the second storage capacitor and the second titanium nitride film, as positively recited in independent claim 1.


As such, no permissible combination of the applied prior art references can reasonably be considered to have suggested the combination of all of the features positively recited in independent claim 1. Further, claims 2-8, 18 and 23 would also not have been suggested by any combination of the applied prior art references for at least the respective dependence of these claims on allowable base claims as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-8, 18 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over any combination of the applied prior art references are earnestly solicited.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-8, 18 and 23 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III

Registration No. 54,734

JAO:DAT/cfr

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: August 21, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461